


AN EARNEST ADDRESS

BY

PUGIN

1851











*Wm. Heathcote*  
A.N.

# EARNEST ADDRESS,

ON

THE ESTABLISHMENT

OF

# THE HIERARCHY.

BY

A. WELBY PUGIN.

---

“Our Fathers have sinned and are not, and we have borne their iniquities.”—*Lamentations of the Prophet Jeremias*, ch. v., v. 7.

---

LONDON :

CHARLES DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND STREET,

AND

48<sup>A</sup>, PATERNOSTER ROW.

---

1851.

PREPARING FOR PRESS.

A NEW VIEW OF AN OLD SUBJECT;

OR, THE

ENGLISH SCHISM

IMPARTIALLY CONSIDERED.

BY

A. WELBY PUGIN.



AN  
EARNEST ADDRESS

ON THE SUBJECT OF

THE HIERARCHY.

---

It may seem somewhat presumptuous for an individual like myself, a layman, to come forward and address my countrymen, on questions which are of the highest possible consequence to religion, but the present time is one so full of importance for the future, that I cannot refrain from offering some observations, which, by the blessing of God, may be the means of infusing great zeal and encouragement into the English Catholics, and, at the same time, by removing some misconceptions, may restore reciprocal charity between us and our separated countrymen.

The ordinary principle of Catholic controversy has been to attack Protestantism in its doctrines and its results; but however true the premises in the abstract, however victorious the argument, a comparatively few conversions have been the only result. The calumnies, the denunciations, against the old religion are more rabid than ever, and it seems that a mere system, that treats only of effects and not causes, can never be attended with any satisfactory end. Protestantism is an effect, not a primary cause; it is a sort of disease, or fungus, that has developed itself on the Catholic body, and as a skilful

physician removes a tumour by treating the whole system, rather than by local application, so I conceive that if we turn from Protestantism and its excesses to the consideration of the primary causes from whence it sprung, we shall do much to heal, if not to remove altogether, the sad, the sickening divisions that now afflict this land. To recapitulate horrid acts perpetrated in the name of religion on either side, to strike balances of burnings and bowellings, is only to add fuel to fire, to lead men to become cruel to each other from a very hatred of cruelty, and, in fine, to perpetuate those animosities and party feelings, which are alike unworthy of christians and injurious to the common weal. Let us, therefore, proceed, in a spirit of truth and charity, most impartially to examine the cause of these said dissensions.

The state of Christendom is full of matter for the serious reflection of sincere and religious men. We not only behold nations which were Catholic barely three centuries ago, now utterly changed, but in countries where externally the old religion yet prevails, it is so lamentably degraded from what we may consider the standard of Catholic excellence, and so great is the progress of indifference and infidelity, that it becomes a matter of the very highest importance to ascertain the primary cause to which all these sad changes may be attributed, and to discover the roots of the cancer that has eaten so far into a divinely constituted system as the church Catholic, and I believe we shall not fail in tracing it to *the common evil of state and temporal power crushing the free action of the church, and enslaving its ministers in worse than Egyptian bondage.* To begin with England—which we all know was once a Catholic country, abounding in ecclesiastical foundations, possessing all the means, all the materials, for the preservation of the faith, the instruction of the people, and support of religion in the greatest solemnity and order—how comes it to pass that it is no longer so? that, without invasion, or conquest, or change of dynasty, the whole has been altered, transformed, the churches plundered, the country separated from Catholic unity, and, in fine, brought to its present lamentable religious position? Who has done this? By whom has it been brought about? Is it the work of Protestantism or not? *I boldly answer, No!*

It is a fearful and terrible example of a Catholic nation betrayed by a corrupted Catholic hierarchy. Englishmen have been betrayed, and what is more, betrayed by the very power from whom, under God, they had a right to expect protection and safety. It was in a solemn convocation, when England's churchmen were assembled, a reverend array of bishops and

abbots and dignitaries, in orphreyed copes and jewelled mitres. Every great cathedral, every diocese, every abbey, was duly represented in that important synod; and yet the fear of a tyrant and the dread of losing a few remaining years of wealth and dignity so far prevailed, that they sacrificed the liberty of the English church at one blow, that church whose liberties at the several consecrations they had sworn to defend, whose freedom they were bound on oath and conscience to preserve. The deed is signed. Harry is declared the *supremum caput* of England's church: not *vox populi*, but *by the voice of the convocation*, the church is sacrificed, the people are sacrificed, and the actors in this vile surrender are the true and lawful bishops and clergy of England. One venerable prelate, aged in years, and worn with fasting and discipline, alone protests against this sinful surrender; his remonstrance is unsupported by his colleagues, and he is speedily brought to trial and execution. His accusers are Catholics, his judges are Catholics, his jury are Catholics, his executioner is a Catholic, and the bells are ringing for High Mass in the steeples of St. Paul's, as the aged bishop ascends the scaffold and receives the martyr's crown.

And yet how do modern Catholics ignorantly charge the death of this great and good man on the Protestant system, which was not even broached at the time.\* All the terrible executions of this dreadful reign were perpetrated before even the externals of the old religion were altered, or its essential doctrines denied. That the English people are no longer faithful Catholics is their misfortune rather than their fault; they were no party to the schism. Little, I imagine, did they even understand its real import; all beyond England or even beyond the confines of their own localities must have appeared to them an unknown region; in externals they beheld no change, the same priest celebrated at the same altar, administered the same Sacraments, and for many years no visible change was apparent in the ancient worship of England's church, and so far from Englishmen contending for what are now called, in clap-trap oratory, the glorious principles of the Reformation, for which

\* This same error found its way into the pages of a periodical of so light a character that it would not be mentioned here, but that its extensive circulation has rendered it a powerful engine of evil. In an article called "A Vision of Whitefriars," a monk is described as asking his way to the Charter House, where the Protestants put the monks to death, and he was answered, to go through Smithfield, where the Catholics burnt the Protestants. But this, though intended to be witty, is false. It was the Catholics of Henry the Eighth's time executed the monks, not at the Charter House, indeed, but at Tyburn. They did the same to Protestants, in Mary's reign, but both executions were in accordance with the decrees of the state and a Catholic parliament.

they are stated to have fought, they were completely betrayed into the loss of their religion and their liberty. The old Catholic bishops had stood nobly by the people in olden and better days, and to their exertions we mainly owe the great charter gained at Runnymede; they had been the guardians of the nation's rights and privileges; but their unworthy successors in the 8th Henry's reign became the betrayers of the flocks. For several centuries the regal power had been gradually spreading its web around the rulers and dignitaries of the church. But now with their own hands, they severed the last link of ecclesiastical liberty, in renouncing the communion of the Holy See, and at once consigned the church and the people to the merciless power of the greatest tyrant that ever occupied the English throne since the Norman conquerors. *Sic volo, sic jubeo*, was the only law, and ruin and destruction began their terrible career; and here let me make a slight digression, to consider a very common and a very natural error. Catholics, as well as Protestants, have been in the habit of assigning the odium of all the ecclesiastical devastations, the plunder of treasuries, destruction of shrines, and suppression of the religious houses to Protestant outrage. Such was formerly my own notion of this matter; and I have no doubt it is the prevailing impression on the minds of nine-tenths of the people. *But it is not so.* All this ruin was brought about by the old ecclesiastical authorities, before a single professed Protestant appeared on the scene. In many dioceses, the rector, vicar, or his curate was compelled to read to the people four times in the year a pastoral, dictated by the bishop, in which the authority of the Holy See was denounced in language scarcely less revolting, gross, insolent, and profane, than that which has been so profusely used in the recent Protestant demonstrations; and this poison was infused into the minds of the people by the divinely appointed channels of truth, their own clergy, and soon the whole country presented a fearful scene of destruction, carried on in the name of the old religion; and it is a most humiliating fact that the greatest destruction of glorious churches, religious houses, shrines, and sacred places, was accomplished by men who still assisted at the holy sacrifice of the Mass and conformed to all the essential practices of the ancient religion. The great spoiler of Lincoln's glorious church was not a Protestant fanatic, but Dr. Heneage, the Catholic archdeacon, and it was he who demolished the shrine of St Hugh, and was, as Willis describes, very forward in defacing shrines and delivering up the treasure of the church into the king's hands! The shrine of St. Thomas was plundered, and his holy relics burnt in the cathedral-yard, while the

canons sang the office and Mass in the choir. The chaplains of the chapel of old London Bridge, dedicated in honour of the same saint, broke their common seal, and petitioned for a new patron, and every Missal, gradual, antiphonal, office, or choir-book, used in England at that period, has the name of every Pope or St. Thomas either erased or defaced by ink ; and this by the hands of the priests and clergy, who read and sang and celebrated from them in this mutilated state. Lead was stript off churches, noble pillars and arches prostrated, the tombs of venerable dead destroyed by men who concluded the despatches of their destructions to Cromwell, with hopes that the Holy Trinity and our Lady would have him in their keeping.

The lands belonging to religious houses were partly divided among courtiers who professed the old religion, and the very suppression of monasteries was carried on in a manner *secundum regulam* : the greater part of the monks resigned and were pensioned or secularized ; a few resisted and were martyred. But many of the abbots became secular dignitaries, and as was the case at Westminster and Peterburgh, bishops of their old abbatial churches created into sees by *royal authority*, and conformed to all the changes enacted by the state. As long as the ordinary ceremonial of the church remained unaltered and Mass was celebrated, the people, with some few exceptions, remained passive spectators of these changes. But when the innovations and destructions became apparent, there was a succession of formidable, though unsuccessful risings, in defence of the old religion. And again, in the succeeding reign of Edward the VI., there were several insurrections on the same ground, to quell which, and to force the new forms on the people, the Protector had recourse to the assistance of a numerous body of foreign mercenaries. I merely mention these facts to show the utter falsity of the prevailing idea that the change of religion in England was a *national* movement, or *that it was even founded on doctrinal differences*. It was a pure question of ecclesiastical power, ceded to the king by the hierarchy, and all subsequent events hang on this act.

The people were very much better than their clergy, and had it not been that the latter were so fettered and bound by the state power as to act like machines in the hands of the civil magistrate, the English nation never would have submitted to these alterations in divine service and articles of faith. But it is very easy to conceive what difficulties attended even a faithful people when betrayed by their own clergy, and is a most striking example of the necessity of *free action* for the ecclesiastical powers advocated in this tract, for without it

a Catholic hierarchy itself offers no security to the faithful, as the sad case of England's schism fully shows.

It is impossible, in the compass of this short address, to enter into the historical details connected with this important period, and which I hope shortly to set forth at length in a treatise, which I am preparing on the English schism. But in order to make good my argument, it will be necessary to take a rapid view of the succeeding reigns of Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth. Soon after the decease of Henry VIII., many considerable alterations were introduced in the manner of celebrating divine service, through the influence of the Protector, Somerset, aided by Cranmer. This first change was a translation of the Mass into English, with little or no alteration of importance, and excepting the irregularity of its introduction and the question of the expediency of such a translation, it was accompanied by little that was objectionable, and from its accordance with the old ritual, was generally received, the vestments and many of the old ceremonies were retained, and altogether this alteration was not so shocking to the feelings of the people. But it was rapidly succeeded by a second, concocted under Genevan influence, full of heresies, and altogether repugnant to Catholic practices and doctrines, but backed by the power of a tyrannical government, this second book was forced on the clergy and the nation, and I grieve to relate that it was used by a great majority of the old priests, though by no means comparable to that which is now in use, and in which several Catholic passages and rubrics, expunged in the second book, have been restored. The publication of this new liturgy was accompanied by much external violence. Altars were demolished, roods cut down, and images, in many places, removed. Still, it must be observed that the old clergy retained their livings, with comparatively few exceptions, and when the temporal penalties on the marriage of those in holy orders were removed, several produced concealed wives, or contracted marriage to the great scandal of those who remained attached to the old discipline, and the merriment of the profane. But this state of things soon drew to a close; the succession of the Princess Mary to the throne, a most zealous Catholic, announced a speedy return to the old faith and discipline. But, unfortunately, the means taken for this end were not sufficiently considered with reference to the altered circumstances of the time. The changes that had been effected during the latter period of her father's reign and that of her brother Edward, had, in a great measure, destroyed religious unity; men had been forced to believe and unbelieve by act of Parliament so often, and to swear they believed a mystery false

to-day that they were to acknowledge on the peril of salvation to-morrow, that a great uncertainty had been raised in the minds of many. Objects and rites, which had been venerated by successive ages, had been treated with open contempt, and although great numbers were still attached to the old religion, there must have been a large body a prey to doubt, and even advocates of new opinions. The clergy, by their base compliances with the changes of the government, had become in a manner contemptible, and their marriage was a great impediment to the reconciliation, as, although in their hearts they were believers in the old religion, they did not relish a separation which was the inevitable consequence of the return to ecclesiastical discipline. It is worthy of remark, that the restoration of the old religion was effected entirely by *the power of the Regale*; and of that very supremacy now attached to the crown that was usurped by Henry for other purposes. The actual bishops were deposed and others nominated by royal mandate. Nor can any of the proceedings be considered truly canonical as a very considerable time elapsed before any open reconciliation could be effected with the Roman Pontiff; and even when that event was brought about, it must be regarded as hollow and unreal. The plunderers of the church required the legalisation of their booty before they made their submission, and the hypocrites, who were embracing each other under the Legate's Benediction, were active during the next reign in persecuting the very religion of which they made so strong a profession. The roods destroyed in the last reign were ordered to be replaced, and the furniture of the churches restored; but the churchwardens' accounts of the period show that the greater part of the articles repurchased were of a base and mean description; and it is painfully amusing to find the same joiner paid for cutting down and putting up the rood according to the various changes enacted by parliament. The altars were also ordered to be restored; but in some of the episcopal visitations it is asked whether it be a fair altar, or only a stone slaid for some grave set up in haste, from which it would appear that the injunctions in some places were but indifferently obeyed. This short and unfortunate reign is associated with the most painful executions by fire inflicted for the most part on fanatical and ignorant persons, who, with their extravagant doctrines, would have fallen into obscurity but for the cruel circumstances of their deaths which has given them a terrible notoriety in English chronicles. At this period toleration was unknown. *The religion of the sovereign regulated that of the people*; and those who refused to conform were speedily conveyed to the executioner. It is impossible to estimate the dreadful and

lasting injury that these horrible cruelties have cast on the memory of those ecclesiastics who were engaged in their condemnation; and from them to thousands of good priests in subsequent ages, who were wholly innocent of such barbarities in thought or deed. Few are aware that these unfortunate persons were executed by a law made constitutionally by the assembled parliament, and by men, many of whom, in a subsequent reign, passed penalties almost as severe against those who refused to renounce the old religion. But such is the strong hold of Fox's folios on the popular mind, that it may be truly said the smoke of Smithfield has obscured the ancient glories of England's church, and at every turn men are found to rekindle the extinguished embers and raise a flame against their Catholic countrymen, who, from their very souls, detest the principles which led to those dreadful scenes of terror, and which are not only in utter opposition to Catholic morality, but which could only have been carried out by men who had become the tools of state tyranny, and who had lost every principle of charity which belonged to their sacred office.

The premature death of this queen opened a new era in the English church. Her sister Elizabeth inherited the real spirit of her father; her predilections, as far as the externals of religion were concerned, were certainly with the old faith, and if she could have succeeded in gaining the recognition of her spiritual supremacy from the bishops, she would have placed it much on the same footing as during the latter part of Henry's reign; but this the bishops, to their eternal honour, most resolutely refused. Taught by the experience of the past, they now resisted the state, and suffered deprivation and imprisonment rather than make an unworthy submission; and it is well worthy of observation, that while in that convocation of Henry VIII.'s reign that surrendered the spiritual power, there was but one bishop, Fisher, who stood resolutely against the act, so on this occasion there was only one bishop found to compromise, Kitchen of Landaff, while all the others remained firm to the faith. Had there been a shadow of political freedom left in England, there can be no doubt that, with such a body of ecclesiastical rulers, the old religion would have been maintained, but such was the annihilating power of the crown in those days, and so utterly unknown were the principles of toleration and religious freedom, that the religious notions of the sovereign were the only standard by which the worship and faith of the whole nation were to be regulated, and hence the queen proceeded to require an external conformity to the new liturgy and articles from the entire mass of her subjects, and to enforce the same by fines, impositions, confiscations, and even



death. And this diabolical system, for we can give it no other appellation, is what fools yet designate as the glorious free principles of the Reformation, principles which, if now in force, would consign the very speaker of such sentiments, as those of freedom, to the nearest jail. A system of coercion utterly repulsive and unbearable to a free nation. Religious freedom is totally distinct from the English Reformation. It is a new idea, unknown to our ancestors who lived in those times. There was no freedom under Henry; no freedom under Edward; no freedom under Mary; no freedom under Elizabeth; no freedom under a long line of their successors, nor would there be now but that knowledge, instruction, and truth have been so diffused by the increased facilities of our age, that notwithstanding all the prejudices of custom, and love of tyrannical power, the public opinion of this and other nations has forced from the reluctant legislature their deliverance from the curse of religious restrictions, which even in these days some seek to revive. It would, however, be most unjust to attach the odium of the persecution of the Catholic body, under Elizabeth and her successors, to the principles of the Church of England; and equally so to attribute the miserable executions of the preceding reign to the Catholic faith. *They were produced by one common cause—the tyranny of the state*, working its direful machinery in either direction as the humour or idea of the Sovereign might direct. But to return, down to the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, it is pretty certain that the whole nation, including the old clergy with some rare exceptions, conformed to all the successive changes of religion enacted by the state; but now a considerable number preferred the loss of the temporal emoluments and dignities to the sacrifice of their conscience, and resigned their livings or retired beyond the sea. Of the old bishops, some were imprisoned, others lived in easy seclusion with the new Archbishop Parker, at Lambeth. Some sought refuge on the Continent, and others, like White, of Lincoln, were permitted to end their days in peaceful retirement. The number of parochial priests who left their cures at this period must have been very considerable, as the new bishops were compelled to ordain many men as ministers, of so low and ignorant a character, that they were only suffered to read the liturgy, but not administer any sacrament. There were, however, still remaining a numerous body of the old Catholic clergy who conformed to the new state of religion partly through the fear of poverty, and partly in hopes that another of those political changes, which they had previously experienced, might occur and restore the ancient rites. It must be remembered that the new liturgy of Elizabeth was by no means so heretical and offensive as that which had

been actually used by the whole nation, priests and all, under Edward VI., but was drawn up with the view of gaining and conciliating those who retained the old faith, and for whom the old Catholic words, on administering the sacrament, were restored. There is no question that in the abstract the book of Common Prayer is exceedingly Catholic, and that the rites of the Church of England, when solemnly administered, are close approximations to the ancient service, and all theologians will admit that the old priests who used the present communion service *with intention* consecrated most truly; and consequently that Mass was celebrated under the new form in hundreds of parochial and other churches long after the accession of Elizabeth. It is lamentable to consider the amount of ignorance that prevails respecting the real system of the Church of England, not only among the English Catholic body, but among persons who professed to be members of its communion. Indeed, so completely has a popular Protestantism replaced her real doctrines among a very great majority of her ostensible children, that anything like a return to her discipline or her doctrines is assailed with a fury and outcry more gross and violent than that with which even the Catholic rites in all their integrity provoke. It is a sad and afflicting spectacle to see good and conscientious men when really acting up to what they are bound to perform, exposed to all the persecution of the state and the brutality of insolent and wealthy laymen, who, ignorant of any ecclesiastical principles or historical facts, assail the pastors of the church to which they ostensibly belong if they carry out the very rubrics of the ordinals and administer its rites in reverence and solemnity. It is, however, still more grievous, that the yells of Protestant ignorance raised against these men should have found an unnatural echo even among some of our own body, who, if they did but reflect that the difficulties and anomalies with which these same men are now contending, were first caused by the base compliance of the old Catholic hierarchy itself, which brought the English church under the bondage of the state, and that they should be regarded by us rather as victims of Catholic degeneracy than the consequence of Protestant error. It is not for those who have gained the ship of Peter, and ride securely in the storm, to mock the unwearied efforts of those good and earnest souls who yet man the shattered bark of England's church, brought among Protestant shoals by its old Catholic commanders, and who still, amid *mutiny* and *oppression*, yet labour to guide her to a haven of safety: and I will say that, battered as is that old hull, it is a great breakwater between the raging waves of infidelity and Catholic truth in this land; that

it has held so long together, under so many disadvantages and difficulties, must be a work of Divine Providence for some great end which remains to be developed. It is quite true that within her pale are arrayed the greatest opponents against whom we have to contend; that her pulpits are often prostituted to the unwearied repetition of the grossest calumnies against the Catholic faith; *but these sad anomalies are not peculiar to this age; they have existed in the Church of England ever since its separation from the communion of the Holy See.* It contains contending elements of good and evil, of Catholic faith and Protestant error that were generated at the schism and which must go on till one or the other is triumphant. Either the Catholic element will prevail, and the body of the church return to its mother; or, which is almost too sad to imagine, the Protestant element will expel all Catholic ritual, rubric, and practices, from her ordinals, drive from her pale every faithful child, and then what remains will collapse, like an expended balloon, and go out with a stench. But we will hope for better things; and, after all, the present state of affairs is certainly not worse, if not a great deal better than they were in the sixteenth century. At that period, as I have shown, the old priests, about whose orders there is not a shadow of doubt, were actually engaged in all the measures of the state, and in the destruction of our most glorious monuments and most sacred shrines. The four most Puritan bishops of Edward VI.'s reign had all been superiors of monastic establishments, and had broken every vow they had ever made. These old clergy were married in violation of their solemn engagements; their successors never entered into them, and consequently are free from the scandal. The great churches are no longer mutilated, but every where restored and protected: surely, on the whole, the Church of England under Queen Victoria is a great advance on the Church of England under Edward VI.; and, if the truth be spoken, after the first race of Elizabethan Puritans, the Anglican bishops have, on the whole, been respectable tenants of the sees. Some exhibited all the zeal of an olden time in restoring the ravages caused by Puritan ascendancy, and preserving the traditions of ancient architectural arrangement, when it had been abandoned throughout Christendom. We must not forget that many noble foundations and works of charity and piety, worthy of the brightest time of Catholic spirit, date from the seventeenth century, and when we consider that the prince bishops of Liege and Germany were employing the vast resources of their dioceses in laying out terraces, forming artificial canals and

fountains, and paganizing their palaces, while the towers of their cathedrals were stunted and incomplete, the names of Hacket and Cosin may awaken a grateful remembrance in a Catholic heart. It would be unjust to test the works of these men by those of preceding centuries. They lived at a period remarkable for debasement all over Europe. Had those countries which nominally retained the ancient faith exhibited a grand exception to the general degradation, and adhered to the noble ecclesiastical traditions of their forefathers, then indeed we should have a grand argument; but so far from this, the spirit of revived paganism flourished, and even commenced, among them, while here in England many of the ecclesiastical erections, though debased in detail, exhibit great traces of the old traditions. Indeed, if we can bring ourselves to regard the Church of England, *abstractedly from all the acts of the state in connexion with her*, we shall find much to reverence and admire. What truly edifying and reverent works have been published on Catholic antiquities by devout members of her communion—by men who appreciated and set forth in most moving and pious language the noble works and lives of the founders of our cathedrals and abbatial churches. But for the labours of these men, every English Catholic antiquity would have fallen into oblivion, and their works are the standard of information to which we all refer. It is impossible to peruse these writings, and, indeed, many of the most celebrated of the old authors of the English church, without being impressed with the fact that they never considered themselves as a newly created body detached from the ancient church, but as a strictly continuous succession of the ancient men, deprived of much of the ancient dignity of religion differing in discipline, and hampered by the state articles, but still the representatives of the old system. It is, indeed, remarkable, that in no official act is the Church of England committed to the term Protestant; it does not occur in the liturgy or any authoritative office, nor in the articles or canons, and in the bidding prayer she prays for the whole state of Christ's Catholic Church, and especially for that part of it established in this dominion. Language which can only admit of one interpretation. Now in opposition to this, the vulgar Protestant idea is that before the Reformation there was an entire reign of idolatry and superstition, that the clergy were all ministers of anti-Christ, worshippers of false gods, and in fine, that the first dawning of christian light and truth commenced with the spiritual headship of the eighth Henry; that all the old clergy were turned out, and that Cranmer, Ridley

and Latimer were the fathers of the new system, to whom it owed its very existence, and to such an extent has this false idea prevailed that, a few years ago, men filling high positions in the leading university, got up a cross to commemorate those arch heretics as founders of the English church. Such is the low and popular Protestant view. Now, let us examine the ordinary Catholic idea that prevails among our own body, and which is very little nearer to the truth than the one I have described. All, anterior to the Reformation, is regarded and described as a sort of Utopia:—pleasant meadows, happy peasants, merry England,—according to Cobbett—bread cheap, and beef for nothing, all holy monks, all holy priests,—holy everybody. Such charity, and such hospitality, and such unity, when every man was a Catholic. I once believed in this Utopia myself, but when tested by stern facts and history it all melts away like a dream. The Catholic religion was founded in England, as in any other country, on a political system that was barbarous,—the people were barbarous, the customs were barbarous, the traditions were barbarous, hence from the very beginning the pure Catholic faith was, in temporal matters, mixed up with barbarism, and most assuredly the conquest of the Norman kings was accompanied with every possible barbarity and injustice. Let any reasonable man then reflect on the enormous difficulties that the Catholic religion had to contend with in preserving its position, and maintaining the truth in such a state of society, and which will be evident to all who attentively study the chronicles of English church history in all their bearings and details.

The barbarism of the people, the tyranny and rapacity of the kings, the constant civil wars and commotions, the contentions between the clergy and the state in the maintenance of the privileges, their great loss of time and money in the continual appeals to Rome, and the spiritual injury to the dioceses from the protracted absence of their bishops on state embassies and temporal affairs, the long vacancies of the sees, and the immense fines and confiscations levied on the church lands from time to time to supply royal extravagance, when we consider all these powerful drawbacks, and the absence of navigable canals for the transport of materials, or even passable roads, it is an overwhelming proof of the mighty power of the Catholic faith, that the face of this country was covered with great and glorious monuments, that yet remain unrivalled, notwithstanding all our increased means practical facilities, and unbounded commercial prosperity. But wonderful as were these glorious works, they were not,

always the result of unalloyed zeal and devotion; and the manner in which the funds were occasionally raised, will not bear the test of justice and charity. There is an amount of alloy in the ecclesiastical splendour of the middle ages; and very many, if not all, the past abuses we have been in the habit of so loudly denouncing in the Church of England are inherited from the old Catholic times,—the ancient churchmen were notorious non-residents and pluralists, and every synod complained of the numerous foreigners intruded into English benefices, who never even visited the churches to which they were appointed, and from which they derived the revenues, while the fabrics and religion fell alike to decay. We had bishops who never saw their cathedrals, and even a bishop who ruled the diocese of Lincoln for twelve years without having been in holy orders. From these few facts gathered at chance among a mass of documents of the same import, it may be conceived there was great room for reform before the Reformation, which was, *in fact, rather a legalization of abuse by state enactments, than a remedy to their continuance.* Among the most flagrant instances of abuses which have descended from a very ancient period, is that of the election of bishops by the chapters, who proceeded in solemn procession to the chapter-house, where they invoked the third person of the holy Trinity, in that sublime hymn, the “*Veni Creator,*” to enlighten their minds, and enable them to elect a worthy and fitting man for the truly and important office of a bishop, being at the same time in the possession of the name of the individual appointed by regal authority, and who, as a matter of course, they announce as the result of their heavenly illumination. Most assuredly, if they really got any divine answer on the occasion, the heavenly nominee would be the antipodes of the ministerial or royal appointment. But what a monstrous impious proceeding; and yet this was practised in old Catholic times, with only this difference, that the Pope had a veto on the election. But there was just as little freedom of voting; and it is sickening to reflect that reverend-looking men, in splendid copes and stoles, have performed this farce beneath the fretted vaults of the glorious old chapter-houses, just the same as their surpliced successors. Is it a matter of wonder that the chapter-houses look desolate, and that the copes were sold and dispersed? All this inconsistency belongs to that *miserable system which binds religion in trammels to the state, and under which nothing can prosper.*

I have now, I trust, in some degree dissipated the Protestant anti-reformation darkness and the Catholic Utopia. I have

represented things as they really were. I have shown that great abuses existed in the English church long before the schism; that the schism itself and its deplorable results was the work of the clergy themselves, corrupted by state influence; that the present Church of England is suffering under the very temporal tyranny to which it was originally committed by their act. I have further shown that in many of its own acts, viewed irrespectively of state measures, there is much that is deserving of our respect; and I must say, that after having deeply studied the subject in all its bearings for many years, whatever may be the doubts and difficulties of Parker's consecration, I cannot bring myself to believe that the Church of England, since the accession of Elizabeth, is a mere imposture and a sham. It is an open, an historical question, on which I, as a Catholic, have a perfect right to exercise my judgment, and I feel bound, as an honest and sincere man, writing not for a party or system but the just cause of truth, to express the result of my investigations on this point, of which in my extended work I can bring much corroborative matter but little known.

Even if this could be demonstrated beyond doubt, which I believe scarcely possible it would not in the least affect the position of English Catholics, who, after the deprivation of the old bishops under Elizabeth, have been under the spiritual jurisdiction of missionaries from the Holy See, and are at length restored by the Providence of God to the blessings of a regular hierarchy. But where there are so many extenuating circumstances to awaken our charity from those of our countrymen who, under *unparalleled circumstances*, are separated from Catholic unity, it is surely unjust and unworthy of our holy cause to join in the vulgar and I believe, unfounded appellation of an act of Parliament church, to a system which is so closely interwoven with the ancient religion and its ministers. The observance of its ritual was enforced by act of Parliament under Elizabeth, and so was the celebration of the old Mass enforced by act of Parliament under Mary. After the church became part of the state it was the regular means of enforcing religious observances, but that its clergy and its rites were *created* by act of Parliament is utterly untrue.

That most popular and talented writer, Cobbett, was a fierce assailant of the Church of England on these very grounds, but his works are full of gross fallacies, and they were certainly not intended for the advancement of Catholic truth; but inasmuch as they are calculated to exasperate men against the present system, they have been frequently circulated by Catholics, without considering that the very abuses which he denounces are, for the most part, derived, as I have shown, from the old

ecclesiastical constitutions,\* and no reliance can possibly be placed in a writer who attributes the *origin* of the Church of England to Henry the VIII.'s divorce.

If the matter were not too lengthy for the space of this pamphlet, I am quite prepared to prove that in every country in Europe that the degradation of religion has been caused by its alliance with the temporal power, and the base compliance of the clergy to its measures; nay, the greatest heresies that have afflicted Christendom have been the work of apostate monks and friars, fostered by temporal princes for their own political ends. Even the sacred Council of Trent was impeded and delayed in every possible manner by the intrigues of the emperor, the King of France, and other potentates. All history will prove that, for many centuries, the church had little or no freedom of action. Even in countries professedly Catholic, and where it was the exclusive religion supported, or even tolerated, by the state, we find Nepotism carried to a frightful extent, and the relations of great men holding an enormous proportion of church benefices, canonries, deaneries, and arch-deaconries, and even those ecclesiastical benefices most intimately connected with the salvation of souls and the preservation of faith among the people, were considered as mere matters of revenue and property, like temporal farms and estates; and while many of those who held these sacred offices for the most part squandered their revenues in luxury and pomp, the people were left to ill-paid and ignorant curates, whom a learned parish priest of the seventeenth century designated most justly under the appellation of *des paysans en noir*. Who can be astonished that active and zealous preachers, though teachers of false doctrines, should win the people from the religion of their fathers, when so cruelly deserted by their natural pastors? To these causes may be attributed the spread of every heresy that has torn the Catholic Church throughout Europe. They have originated in the supineness and neglect of the pastors, and the consequent ravages of the wolves on their flocks. And to resist false doctrine by temporal punishment on its propagation, is a miserable system, which, independent of its abstract

\* It is curious to observe how the term "Parson" has become associated with a Protestant signification, whereas, in truth, it is an old Catholic title, derived from the Latin *Persona*, and is found on numerous tombs and brasses of ecclesiastics, in Latin, Norman, French and English inscriptions, of the mediæval period. I have heard an anecdote of a young divine who, when reading the parable of the Good Samaritan to his scholars, was fearful of giving scandal by saying, "a certain *Priest* passed by," &c.; and to obviate the difficulty he substituted the word *Parson*, little thinking, in his simplicity, that the term was almost synonymous.



cruelty and injustice, is unworthy of men professing Catholic truth. As long as the clergy instruct their people and minister to their spiritual necessities, heresies can never take root or flourish, and it is only the sad causes that I have above mentioned to which we can attribute the decay of religion on the continent, and the extended spread of schism and error.

I have gone thus at length into the real causes which have led to schism and heresy in countries originally Catholic, in order to impress you the more fully with the immense importance of the principles on which our new hierarchy has been founded. Those who have not deeply studied ecclesiastical history in all its bearings, are scarcely qualified to enter into the full appreciation which the blessings of a hierarchy established on apostolic principles, and irrespective of the temporal government, is calculated to bring on the faithful, provided they respond by intention and deeds to the spiritual boon that the sovereign Pontiff has granted to them. It has been said that the Holy Father could not venture to perform such an act in any other Christian country in Europe, and I believe this is true. But why then should England be an exception. For two reasons;—first, that the Pope believed England to be the most free and liberal country in the world; he believed that she had established that noblest of all noble principles, *perfect religious freedom*. We all believed it; we all imagined that as long as the civil laws were respected, that all spiritual government, all ecclesiastical arrangements affecting the Catholic subjects of the country were perfectly free; *and they were so, indeed, and in law*. But to the eternal disgrace and ignominy of this land, a retrograde movement has been commenced which will end in the shame of those who proposed it, which although it will not in any way affect the spiritual working of the ecclesiastical system which has been established has lowered England in the scale of nations, and tarnished that glorious title which she possessed.

2nd. The Holy Father could do this in England for another reason. In every other country in Europe, the state, and *I am sorry to say it*, pays the ministers of religion; but here, thank God, religion supports itself; and receiving nothing, it asks nothing of the state. In countries where a considerable portion of the taxes are paid away in salaries and pensions for ecclesiastical purposes, the temporal authorities expect some voice in the appointment of those they pay; but, as I said before, in England as we receive nothing, *thank God, we receive nothing*, it would be most unreasonable and monstrous indeed for the minister to interfere and meddle with men, who are in no way beholden to him for support;—men who in his eyes and the eyes of the law, are only subjects amenable to the

common law of the land. If they offend that, there are courts and juries to try them. Now, my Catholic countrymen, this is the only hierarchy existing under a monarchy *that is founded* on free principles; nay, more, *that has been founded on free principles almost from the apostolic ages*. In a country professing freedom and professing to admire freedom, the *existence of such a fact should have been hailed as the greatest progress that the age has yet produced*; but, my dear friends, our Protestant countrymen, as a mass, do not believe it—do not understand it. We have been so long associated with every description of tyranny, cruelty, oppression and persecution, that now we appear under a form of freedom, they cannot conceive it. They say, are not these men of the same faith as they who burnt our fathers? The Armada that was to have made England a province of the Spanish monarchy, was not that blessed by a Pope? Was not James II. a Catholic; and was he not an ally and pensioner of the fourteenth Louis, who expelled every Protestant from his state, and drove them out in want and misery? Did he not seek to restore this religion, and change our institutions by force? All this is most true: it was so. James was a tyrant—a counterpart of the tyrant Louis—a man who lived on dissimulation. I do believe his ostensible toleration acts were a pretence to overthrow the Church of England by the aid of increasing dissent, to destroy that which was nearer to him by the aid of what was further removed, and then to have replaced the latter by a forced Catholicism. He, like his French ally, was sunk in private vice, and, like him, would not, improbably, have sought (most damnable delusion) to have expiated his crimes by the tyrannical treatment of his non conforming subjects. He belonged to a school of tyrants who thought, even in religion, their will was law for all. But how miserably has every scheme, got up by human power, for the restoration of the Catholic religion in England on such execrable principles failed. Indeed, while the Catholic religion was associated, and as it was, with tyranny, and maintained *on exclusive principles*, and while the very idea of religious liberty was *unknown to any religion, either Protestant or Catholic*, I do not hesitate to say that if it had been introduced on such a system it would have been a curse to the country, and the greatest disaster that could have occurred to the Catholic religion itself. No; the Providence of God reserved the foundation of the Catholic hierarchy in this land till the time had arrived when the execrable and narrow ideas of the latter centuries had been exploded every where; when, unprotected by princes, unsupported by a single temporal privilege or power, it should exercise its apostolic functions in perfect charity with all, and using no weapons for its progress

or defence but preaching and prayer. These are the never-failing supports of the church, and she has never been weak but when neglecting them, she has fallen back on temporal power and aid. But our countrymen in general will not believe this as yet; it is perhaps more than we can well expect, and we must for a while suffer them with all possible patience. How many of us, educated in Protestant prejudices, held the same notions and believed the same calumnies of which we are now the victims and objects! When I say *calumnies*, I mean as applied to our *present principles*, or the *Catholic faith in the abstract*, for all kinds of horrible cruelties and tyrannies and massacres have been perpetrated by men professing Catholicism, and under its very name. I am ready with every sincere Catholic in the land to join in the most solemn condemnation of all persecution, or religious coercion, or propagation of religion by temporal power, or any of those monstrous doctrines which were certainly once held by men professing the Catholic religion, *but which formed no part of its essential doctrines at any time, and which has been utterly abandoned throughout the Christian world.* It is therefore to be hoped that in process of time we shall be not held individually answerable for every unfortunate man that has been executed by various governments from Jerome of Prague downwards.

But to return: I have stated that this is the first free hierarchy created under a monarchy, since the apostolic time; and most zealously should every English Catholic watch over it, that when legal restrictions fail to destroy its action, courtesy and favour be not attempted with more success. I should denounce any man as a traitor to the cause and to religion who would aid or contribute in any way to impede direct and free communication between the English bishops and the sovereign Pontiff; this is the Divine constitution by which the Catholic faith is ordained by the Providence of God to be preserved in unity through so many lands and people. It is a perpetual circulation, flowing from the centre to the extremities, and again returning to its source. While this circulation is free and unimpeded, religion may be expected to prosper and discipline flourish, but when the channels are clogged by diplomatic impediments the faithful are sure to suffer, and if they are cut off *the faithful decay*, even though all the machinery of the hierarchy remain, as I have clearly set forth in the sad but instructive history of England's schism. Let us, then, guard this great, this unparalleled blessing with all the diligence possible, and preserve the glorious freedom we have got in this, which we may appropriately term the virgin hierarchy unpoluted and uncorrupted with state intrigue and diplomacy.

In a recent article, printed in the "Times," on the Bishop of Birmingham's letter, the editor most tauntingly asks if we consider that we are more powerful now than we were in the days of Leo X., and I most unhesitatingly answer—*ten times more powerful*. The days of the tenth Leo were full of corruption: it was the spring of revived paganism and heresy; the church had just cast off her ancient traditions and was dressing out her temples in a heathen guise; the most fearful heresies were rife on every side; abuses intolerable to christian men existed throughout Christendom; the sacred reforms and decrees of the Tridentine fathers had not been set forth; the corruptions of centuries were drawing to a head and the very fountain of jurisdiction itself, the Holy See, seemed poisoned with the luxury of the day; Catholicism was still wrought up with barbarisms of the nations it had converted, and which, though it had quelled, it had never extinguished. The dawn of religious freedom had not struck one ray on the dark horizon of religious persecution; if ever there was a time when a Catholic could have despaired of the promises of God to his Church *it was then*. But now there is every cause for hope, *aye, for exultation*. The Catholic religion now exists on free principles: she has got rid of one immense element of corruption in her vast temporal wealth; her prelates have lost the temporal prince and regained the Christian bishop; we have active missionaries and preachers in lieu of lazy abbés, flirting in parks and gardens; we have no commendatory abbots, or misapplied revenues of religious houses, but active and religious orders of charity; no tonsured children holding great ecclesiastical benefices: and we have a clergy who commence to appreciate and, indeed, restore the long neglected and despised architecture of Christendom; paganism is at a discount, *at a ruinous sacrifice*. Are we as strong as in Leo's days? Indeed I can tell the editor of the "Times" that in Catholic matters he knows nothing: he may be able to awaken popular fury and prejudice and to manufacture ready clap-trap for the million, but he has waded considerably beyond his depth in this contest, and while we are on this matter I will remark, in that very article he unchurches the Church of England itself, by putting forth that what the state had done once it could do again; that it had *extinguished*—mark the word *extinguished*—the old *hierarchy and replaced it by men of another creed*. If this be true, he has destroyed all idea of succession, and reduced it to a *state creation*; this idea may suit the minister, it may suit the men who consider churches are mere engines of state influence and power; but, Catholic as I am, I do not believe it in regard of the English church, and I do greatly mistake, if him and the like of him, will not burn

themselves to the quick ere they can trample out the Catholic embers that yet glow within its pale.

I perceive that the state are making provisions to render legacies to the church illegal. This appears to me a measure, which, though intended in an opposite direction, that is likely to be attended with much practical benefit to the church, as it will lead men to do while living what they now often put off till after death; and it will not only impart a much greater merit to their gift before God, but it will save all the duty usually paid to government, and a considerable sum to lawyers, all of which would be avoided by *laying the gift on the altar*. Nothing can be worse than this legacy system, however good and holy a man may be, if he expects a large reversion at the death of an individual, it is almost beyond the powers of human nature to expect that he will not take considerable interest in the state of his health, and although anything like the desire of his departure is too shocking to entertain, still, if he could be removed to a state of bliss, it would not be a very afflicting occurrence. The moment a rich old fellow dies, all the relations to the ninetieth degree turn up and assemble, and if they understand his money has been left to the church the indignation is general. Was there ever such a monstrous thing known, when he had so many relatives, and some so slenderly provided for? One of his nephews had married on the strength of his expectations, and was now burdened with a numerous family, who would be wholly without fortunes. Another had enlarged his dining-room, and built a conservatory on the same grounds, and this money to go to the bishops; they would not allow it, they will have law. A lawyer is present and steps forward; he quite agrees; it is certainly a case for a British jury; he would be happy to conduct it himself; though a Catholic, he considers family interests should be protected. Proceedings are begun; and to prevent scandal and expense, and the glorious uncertainty of the law, half the property is made over in a compromise, and is the speedy cause of a dozen secondary suits among the relations themselves, who do not consider that they are fairly dealt with by each other. And now another bishop considers he has a prior claim or equal right on the residue. The first bishop cannot admit the justice of the premises. It must be referred to arbitration. Grave men travel up to London, put up at first-rate hotels, keep up good cheer, drive about in glass coaches, see sights, and occasionally sit in a back room round a green baize table. Portly and sinewy lawyers, with attendants bearing blue bags full of documents, read long extracts from interminable deeds. Rejoinder next day, all the preceding arguments demolished, time is up, but to-morrow the first party will

again address on fresh grounds. Days go by, one week gone, hotel bills running on, the cost of a small parochial church in the second pointed style swallowed up already, proceedings becoming a bore, a compromise proposed, could not two mutual friends settle it? They agree, divide again, and deduct expenses. Only one-third of the whole sum reduced by subdivision to a very moderate amount. Both bishops reported to be immensely rich, and to have received an inexhaustible fortune, no subscriptions in consequence. Pious ladies are astonished that anything should be expected from them under such circumstances. Both bishops set forth what is quite true, that the sum received was so reduced as to be comparatively small. Nobody believes it, or if they do, they pretend they do not, and excuse themselves for not giving on those grounds. Both bishops are considerably minus at the end of the year that the great benefaction fell in.

This is no exaggeration of the evils attendant on the legacy system, and therefore I should view any legal enactment that will induce men *to be more liberal during their lives, and less relying on testamentary bequests, as a great practical blessing.* I may be considered as a visionary and enthusiast, but I am convinced that if Catholics acted practically up to the sincerity and good faith that we have a right to expect among Christian men, we could transact most important matters in the old Anglo-Saxon fashion, over shrines and before altars, and save large sums in stamps and deeds, which are no security after all, and often made the subjects of vexatious litigation. How vain are all these charters and testamentary restrictions; little better than waste wax and parchment. What pains did the venerable founders of some of the old Oxford colleges incur to secure those institutions from change; and yet, in a comparatively few years, the whole became practically a dead letter; the altars and the very chantries pulled down, all the beautiful ornaments seized and sold by the state, and the costly foundation of Archbishop Chichele, endowed (in his remorse for the horrors of the French war, which he had instigated) for the souls of the slain, denuded of the very altars where the expiatory services were to have been offered, and the chantry priests replaced by good easy men, who say their own prayers, quite irrespectively of the memory of the brave knights and yeomen who fell on the field of Agincourt. I mention these things to show the vanity of endowments, and of providing for futurity in church matters, *when the only security, consists in the succession of well-instructed and apostolic men, keeping up faith and discipline.* As for royal charters, they were formerly made the pretext for

renewals, under great fines, at each accession, and one of the old Norman tyrants, being short of money, broke up his old seal, and *made every man pay enormously for the impression of his new device.*

I see also that it is proposed to make such enactments as will make endowments illegal, and singularly enough the Belgian government have actually passed a similar law. So the secular clergy are at last to receive and practice the rule of St. Francis, and advance in Christian perfection through the instrumentality of the Protestant Prime Minister, but is it not wonderful that he should seek to establish the same rule as the seraphic doctor, though I fear we can hardly give him credit for the same intentions; but whatever they may be, if the result prevents the accumulation of vast ecclesiastical properties, it will be a great blessing, *and we must admit that the never-failing endowment of the church is in the succession of baptized faithful men, filled with the spirit of religion, and willing to labour like men for its support and solemn maintenance.* This is an inexhaustible treasure which no government can sequester, no law reach, no tyranny impair; this is an apostolical endowment, and while the clergy are faithful to the people and the people to the clergy, which is a corresponding natural consequence, she needs no other; and I will maintain, that whenever the clergy have lived in great wealth, irrespective of the people it has separated them, and left them alone in their dignity, till heresy has taken root among their deserted flocks up to the very gates of the episcopal palace. Was it not so in the diocese of Salzburg, where the prince bishop ruled supreme as a temporal monarch in all but his title and habit? and little knew he of his flock, little heeded he his clergy, or their acts, till at length, more than twenty thousand of his flock and subjects abandoned the profession of the Catholic faith for the Lutheran heresy. These prince bishops were positive curses to religion: by the masses of the people they were only known as princes, and seldom were they seen, they saw their bailiffs, their tithe gatherers, they saw the halberdiers coming to drag the unfortunate defaulter to the bishop's gaol, but the bishop, their pastor, they rarely saw, except when a numerous cavalcade of horsemen, surrounding a velvet chariot, passed along the road, or when, in a full riding-habit, surrounded by huntsmen and retainers, he galloped recklessly through crops and vineyards, leaving ruin and destruction to the distracted peasants. Such were some of the prince bishops of Cologne, of Salzburg, of Leige, of Strasburg, and many others. Such were the consequences of bishoprics with such

enormous revenues that none but a king's brother or nephew, or some such person, could aspire to fill them.

Wherever a richly endowed clergy exist they are no longer beloved by the people ; and it is to this very cause that we may attribute the defection from the faith of so many countries in the 16th century. The ecclesiastics had become the temporal rulers and tax receivers instead of their fathers and shepherds. Even here in England, Catholic England, Merrye England, in Richard the Second's reign, sixty thousand men were in arms to exterminate the nobles and higher order of clergy : the unfortunate and pious archbishop, Simon Sudbury, they succeeded in beheading, and had their whole plot been completed, the friars alone would have been spared in the massacre, and that, most probably, on account of their wearing a poor habit, and mingling and ministering to the lower class. When the clergy of a country is once placed above the need of the people's aid and offering, it is a state of things fraught with danger to both. There is a spirit of reciprocity under the old apostolic system that is a mutual protection, and that once gone, the wealth and endowment becomes a curse and a snare. We read an account of the death of a holy Catholic bishop who addressed the surrounding clergy with these memorable words :—" I die, as becomes a bishop of God's Church, without money and without debts." Oh ! if all the ancient bishops would have said the same, how many souls would have escaped the penalty of their avarice. Political economists and ministers of state cannot reach the true church revenues with their artillery ; the Catholic faith and practice in its purity is unassailable with the longest range they possess. *It is only when it becomes corrupt that it falls into their clutches*, but, by the blessing of God, this shall not be : with so many warnings of the past, for the future we shall avoid the old rocks of temporal wealth and endowments, which have been the cause of ruin, and scandal, and corruption in former ages.

The closer we examine the practical result of all these large endowments, the more we shall be convinced that they were attended with far more evil than good to the foundations which possessed them. The riches of the great churches have rendered them, in all ages, objects of cupidity to the temporal rulers, who, for the sake of their revenues, deprived the dioceses of their spiritual rulers, and kept the appointments open for years, to enable them to squander the revenues on their own luxury and extravagance ; and all history will show that superior piety, and learning, and ecclesiastical discipline, were by no means a certain recommendation to the high offices of the church, connected as they were with great temporal wealth and



power, and that those who were often selected to fill them were chosen from their distinguished birth, connexions, and the likelihood of a compliance with the royal will, rather than as vigilant pastors and maintainers of ecclesiastical discipline. This, as might be expected, created a class of superior clergy odious to the body of the people and unfaithful to their sacred duties, and was the occasion of some of those frightful excesses which were exercised against the episcopal order in English rebellions long before the Reformation.

*The only dependable endowment of the church is to be found in the zeal and devotion of the faithful.* While there is a succession of baptized persons, brought up in the true faith, there must be a succession of funds that cannot fail or be taken away. Moreover, this wealth, continually flowing in to supply the occurring wants of the church and its ministers, present no tangible temptations, nor even the possibility of plunder, which is inseparable from great estates and standing wealth, which have been the occasion of such dreadful sacrilege and abuse in former centuries. There appears to be an internal element of corruption in the possession of great revenues, which causes the decay of that which it is intended to preserve, and the history of every richly endowed church presents a most lamentable succession of misapplication of its revenues, revolting abuses, and *its final dissolution, for the sake of its very wealth.* Moreover, there has been another most fatal result to religion in the irresponsible possession of rich endowments, as almost without exception, the duties have been vicariously performed, so that the very revenues have induced the evil of non-residence, while the spiritual consolations have been administered by some poor and often ignorant curate, provided at the lowest salary.

I feel confident that while the true spirit is kept alive among the people, no investment is so certain and secure. Catholics are producers of wealth, besides so many men of noble and ancient families who still adhere to the Catholic faith, there are artists, manufacturers, merchants, traders, mechanics, labourers, all not only living but accumulating by their exertions; and is it to be supposed that any of all these classes, if animated by the spirit of their religion, will be not ready to devote a good portion of their temporal means to the support of their clergy, and, indeed, the splendour of religion? If they do not, then of course they must renounce the faith and cease to require the assistance of priests; but I maintain that all practical Catholics must, in virtue of their faith, be regular supporters of religion, though certainly up to the present time, either through a false delicacy or some other indefensible reason, *this duty of contributing has not been sufficiently urged,* and I am confident that

many are deficient in this important part rather from want of reflection and instruction than good-will. But I do believe, that if this duty were properly and forcibly urged by the clergy, that it will be responded to most heartily, and especially as temporal laws are in preparation to deprive the church of other means of support.

No human legislation can interfere with the spiritual ties that must exist between the faithful and their clergy, while the latter remain true to their sacred duties and office. As well might an act be passed to sever the husband from the wife, the parent from the child, as to disunite a faithful people from an apostolic clergy. As long as they are devoted to a faithful ministration of these sacred duties, and *serve God*, we have every thing to hope and nothing to fear: serving God is the great source of all ecclesiastical strength. It was in that respect so many of the ancient bishops failed: *they did not serve God*. Was not this acknowledgement wrung from the remorse of an English prelate famous in history, a man who, though a legate and a cardinal, was in reality a greater instrument in producing the English schism than the arch-heretic Cranmer himself; by his intolerable pride, by his worldly splendour and state, he made the highest ecclesiastical office an occasion of scandal and reproach; by the vexatious exercise of his legatine power he caused the spiritual authority of the Roman Pontiff to become an odious and intolerable burden; by dissolving religious houses to found institutions in his own name, he paved the way for the destruction of every great religious establishment; and when disgraced by that Prince to whom he had sacrificed his life and his office, and abandoned by the world to die then in anguish of heart, he exclaimed, "Had I served my God as I have served my king, he would not have thus deserted me in my old age." What a dreadful—what a fearful state of soul, for this old man when he felt himself deserted by God! But his history and his end are but the epitome of a multitude of other celebrated ecclesiastics, who have *served the king and been forsaken of God*, it is not only the history of men, but it is the history of the decay of religion itself among many of the most powerful nations of Christendom. How very injurious must the rule of such men as Richelieu, Mazarin, and, to come still later, the infamous Abbé Dubois, wearing the sacred habit of religion, engrossing the most sacred and important offices for the sake of their revenues,\* and with the externals of ministers of

\* The Abbé Dubois was not only Archbishop of Cambrai, but commendatory abbot of Nogent-sous-coucy, St. Just, Airvaux, Bourgeuil, Berg St. Vinox, St. Bertin, Cercamp. He was eventually created cardinal; and it is reported

the God of mercy and of justice, ruling with all the diabolical machinery of tyranny and oppression, men who, like Talleyrand, used language only to conceal thought, whose smile was more dreadful than their frown, as disguising intentions the less easy to escape; the possession of whose very confidence was attended with the peril of life to the unhappy object who held it, whose sumptuous banquets and entertainments were made at a cost of lands given in better days for religion and the poor, perverted to their ostentation and magnificence; and these very entertainments were of so hollow a character that the gorgeous Gobelin hangings may be said to have only covered the dark ways which not unfrequently conducted the guests to the dungeons of Vincennes or the torture chamber of the bastille. Such are the men who have under the name of their ecclesiastical dignity been odious in a free country; and, what is most unfortunate, while there were so many truly saintly cardinals who lived in comparative retirement, and died in the faithful discharge of their sacred duties, scarcely known to the pages of history, the most famous men of the order are often its disgrace. St. Carlo Borromeo, of Milan, is indeed an exception, his virtues and his acts have commanded the admiration and respect of all classes of men; but he was detached from all temporal considerations, and we indeed may say *he served his God*.

The severest injury inflicted on the Catholic religion in France was the infamous revocation of the edict of Nantes, when all good faith and common charity were utterly violated by a tyrant, whose conduct has been ascribed to the lowest and basest motives of vain superstition, as attempting to appease Divine vengeance for his own flagrant violation of its laws, by exercising the most tyrannical cruelty and oppression on those of his subjects who were separated from Catholic unity, among whom there were doubtless many, who invincibly ignorant of the true faith, but striving to serve God to the best of their knowledge, were far more justified in his sight than the orthodox author of the persecution. Had not the French bishops of the time been sadly infected with the old and fatal notion of using temporal coercion in enforcing the propagation of the faith, they would have come forward in a body, and stood between the throne and the innocent objects of their king's vengeance. They should have represented to him, that though separated in religious observances, they were still his subjects and Christians, that they had invested all their property in the pursuits of industry and manu-

that the anguish conceived by the Holy Father for having bestowed the purple on such a man, when he discovered his unworthiness, hastened the Pontiff's death.

factures on the faith of the royal charter of protection, and that it would be a violation not only of honour but the first principles of Christian charity and justice. Had they done this, what merit must they have gained in the sight of God! what honour would they have received in the eyes of all good men! what souls might they have eventually gained back to the fold of unity, by proving themselves to be the ministers of peace and justice! But it was not so; and this act, which inflicted an everlasting disgrace on its promoters, and a fatal injury to the French Church, was celebrated by fêtes and rejoicings, while some short-sighted ecclesiastics wrote congratulations in prose and verse.

As but little time was granted for the emigration of the Protestant families any one may conceive the losses, the miseries, the distresses they must have endured: the sick, the infirm, the aged, the infant, were alike driven forth to seek an asylum where they might, in strange lands, and among strange people and tongues. The time for departure has expired, the ports are full of vessels loosening their canvass to the breeze, their decks are crowded with afflicted people, huddled together in sorrow and dismay; a few remain behind scarcely less sorrowing than they who depart, but it is those who, wanting courage to fly and leave their all, have outwardly conformed to what their heart does not receive. Oh, sad! oh, lamentable spectacle! honest men become hypocrites, and forced worshippers at a service to which neither their spirit or conviction unites. If there ever was a system forged in hell for destroying faith and creating infidelity, it is that which places men's souls and consciences under the iron rule of temporal tyranny.

Englishmen, this was the principle of government under Henry VIII.; this was the principle of Edward VI.; this was the principle of Queen Mary; it was the principle of Queen Elizabeth; it was the principle of *Louis le Grand*; and it is the principle of tyranny from which we vainly thought we were free as air; but links of which are now again forging by the state, aided, through inexplicable infatuation, by the very men who should be foremost in joining with us to reduce them to powder. But to return:—The transports have sailed, and Satan is watching, with exulting eye, the lessening canvass of the receding fleet. France is now delivered to his hands: there is perfect external conformity in religion, there is an awful conformity; but the divine parable of the wheat field is forgotten, *and no room is left for the tares*; all those vents, all those pores, which in a state of religious freedom, like safety valves, free the church from those corruptions and infidelities that in a great body of men ever have existed, and must exist, are now

closed. Every one went to Mass, but the bended head at the elevation often concealed the sneer of infidelity, and the forced communicant reviles the body of his Lord; and so it went on, and France was a *Catholic country*, and there were no Protestants at all to be seen or heard; but there were *infidels on every side*, men who *believed nothing*, but *conformed to everything*, and soon a consuming fire of unbelief, concealed, indeed, under a green surface, but wreathing itself through unseen fissures under the whole fabric of society was rapidly gaining ground. It penetrated the hearts of men in every station, in every garb and office. There was infidelity among the peasants, there was infidelity in the city, there was infidelity in the court, there was infidelity in the council, there was infidelity in the church itself, and, at length, the powers of darkness break forth from their lurking places and throw off the mask, and, in an incredibly brief space, this *exclusively Catholic country* publicly denies—what? Some articles of faith? No; the *very existence of a God*. The churches are closed and desecrated, those of the clergy who remained faithful massacred and dispersed, and a common prostitute worshipped in Nôtre Dame. Such was the end of the great church of France,\* a church which, in the days of its ancient glory, has raised the finest monuments in Christendom to the honour of the Almighty, and which can number even some of its temporal rulers among the saints of God.

The new church of France is established under far more auspicious circumstances. The clergy, though receiving some temporal remuneration from the state,† are still comparatively free, and there is the blessing of universal toleration and free exercise of religion; consequently, even in a country so desolated by infidelity, religion is rapidly gaining ground. The tranquillity of the church during the recent political convulsion has proved the wonderful advantages of the separation of ecclesiastical from the temporal. It has afforded an occasion which has raised the ecclesiastical character in the minds of the most ferocious of the human race. The noble death of the venerated archbishop, on an errand of charity, undertaken amidst all the horrors of street warfare, has made a lasting impression on the people. It may be truly said, that the ball

\* The old sees were annihilated by the Pope, and the present church is an entirely new construction.

† It is much to be questioned whether the money received by the French clergy from the government is not practically a diminution of their revenue. They are supposed to be supported by the miserable pittance they receive, and in some manner it imparts the appearance of government officials of their sacred office.

which inflicted his mortal wound has reached the hearts of thousands who would have remained impenetrable to a less forcible example of a chief pastor's love.

I trust that what I have brought forward will be the means of animating every Catholic, and every just and honest man, in this land with the spirit of strongest resistance of any measures that would tend in the least degree to bring our hierarchy, founded on principles of true ecclesiastical liberty, and, indeed, an *apostolic* rule, under the iron grasp of state government;\* from the enmity of the worldly powers we have *nothing* to fear; from their favour and protection *everything*. We, neither ask for temporal aid or temporal honour: the faithful will provide the first, the second is not worth having. Nor has the Sovereign in her gift so noble a title to respect as that which the very office of a bishop, duly performed, imparts to the ecclesiastic who holds it.

But, God forbid that our ecclesiastical rulers should ever be again mixed up with the intrigues of a minister or the adulation of an audience-chamber. In the eye of the law, our bishops will only rank as English citizens and subjects; they will bear the ordinary burdens of tax and rate;—be exempt from any odious exemptions and privileges, and amenable to the common law of the land. But to us they will be the ministers of divine and ecclesiastical authority upon earth; they will receive our obedience and respect; we shall look on them as imbued with the holiest powers; they will consecrate the churches we raise for the worship of Almighty God, and the cemeteries where we shall repose when dead; they will anoint the altars of sacrifice with the holy chrism; they will impart the Holy Spirit in the sacrament of orders to successive generations of ecclesiastics, brought up under their guidance in their seminaries and colleges. They will be true pastors and shepherds of souls, and fathers of the poor. Denuded of their worldly magnificence, that I have shown to have been in former ages so fearful a snare, they will devote their entire lives and energies to the sacred duties of their office. And, my Catholic friends and brethren, shall not we, on our side, correspond to our chief pastors: thus, I may say, divinely established for our

\* To prevent misconception, it may be well to remark, that by state tyranny, it is not intended to refer only to the subjection of the Church under a king or monarchy, but to all legislation whatever interfering with ecclesiastical discipline and matters of faith. The Church may suffer the greatest oppression under a republic as at Venice, or under a parliament as during the civil wars. It is the principle of legislative interference with the Church under *any political form* that is so dangerous and destructive to faith and discipline.

support and consolation? Shall we not place in their hands the temporal means to enable them to fulfil the full measure of their usefulness? God forbid: for I do not hesitate to say that if we neglect to support those whom God hath given us, he will deprive us of this great blessing. It will be vain if you agree with me in denouncing the temporal evils of rich endowments and state pensions, if you do not supply the necessities of the church by renewing the apostolic system of *continual and successive offerings*. The real, the spiritual success of what the Holy Father has done for us depends *on our exertions*. I have shown that it is not in endowments, in testamentary bequests, that the true source of the church revenues are to be found; but *in the hearts, the faithful hearts of her children*. Oh! let not this be a theory but a practice, which you would fulfil as earnestly and truly as your Easter communion. Let every man send, according to his gains and means, a reasonable sum to his diocesan for *episcopal purposes*, independent of any other duties or local works in which he may be engaged; *let this be a distinct matter from all others*. Let every faithful man make a solemn engagement before God to do this, otherwise the *Te Deum* we have sung, the addresses of thankfulness we have signed, are a farce and a mockery. We have now an opportunity to show what the *free principle can do*, and if we carry it out nobly we shall be a beacon for Christendom. Let us show what a free hierarchy can do without pension from the state, *without endowed property, without tithes or rates, or one coercive payment from friend or foe*. Let us prove and show that Christ's church can flourish on its own strength and the love of its children, and their free-will offerings. If you carry this out I can promise you a reign of Catholic glory to which the mediæval splendours were as nothing. Glorious as are the mighty fabrics they raised, they are often connected with men and times which detract from the fairness of the architecture, and tarnish the gilding of the sanctuary; but if the church, under the difficulties of such systems, could do so much, what cannot she perform when relieved from these bonds? What ought men not to expect *under a free system and external peace?* and if we live as we ought as Catholics *to serve God* nothing is impossible to achieve. I fear not our enemies; I fear not our calumniators; I fear not the tyranny of state measures. I have but one fear; that is, *I fear ourselves*. I fear we have been so long slumbering on under our imperfect ecclesiastical rules, that now the whole is come in all its fulness, we shall not duly appreciate the blessing, and respond to our altered circumstances. We are comparatively a small body; but we could spare many that bear our name, and yet be strengthened in our cause.

I would we were quit of all those men, who, while retaining the name of Catholic, could betray the church to state tyranny. I would we were quit of all those men, who, retaining the name of Catholic, afflict the pastors and scandalise the faithful, by forsaking the holy sacraments of the church. I would we were quit of all those men, who, while retaining the name of Catholic, exhibit no realisation of its principles in their lives, but squander their revenues in every species of worldly vanity and folly, neglecting the church and its ministers, and abandoning the temple of God to decay. I would we were quit of all those indifferent men, bearing the name of Catholic, who are almost too apathetic to try and save their own souls, and who never aid or contribute in any good work whatever; and I would we were quit of all men who degrade religion by dressing it up in pagan and paltry externals, and who import the worst style of the most corrupt period of continental ecclesiology into a land full of the purest Catholic traditions. For all these are only drags on the wheel of the revival of faith and Catholic art and practices; and I believe, if we had only true zealous men left, like Gideon's three hundred lappers up of water, we should be in a better position to resist the Midianites. But this cannot be. We must trust in the arm of Almighty God to support us, and animate all with a good spirit. If ever there was a time or occasion when we might hope for unity in the Catholic body, this is one. If there could be imagined a moving cause so powerful as to break up local prejudices, party feelings and unworthy division, it is this restoration of ecclesiastical government, and gathering our shattered and separated fragments into a real church. If there ever was a magnetic power to draw gold from misers, to make niggards liberal, and sluggards active, it is now. If ever there was an event which was calculated to promote unity of action and unity of soul, to make men confess their past sins, and to make good resolutions for the future, to make them liberal to religion, and devout and thankful to God, animating them with a true spirit of the faith they profess, and lead them to discard for ever paganism and its wretched incongruities, and to labour with heart and soul for the revival of the true architecture created by the Christian religion itself, it is the foundation of this English Hierarchy which should be our delight and our glory, and which should now become one of the earnest objects of our lives and actions to support and maintain in all *freedom, honour, and integrity, in sæcula sæculorum.* Amen.

A. WELBY PUGIN.













